

# THE SUCCESSION TO BALDWIN II OF JERUSALEM: ENGLISH IMPACT ON THE EAST

HANS EBERHARD MAYER

The first accessions of rulers in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem were difficult. When Godfrey of Bouillon died in 1100 he willed to Patriarch Daimbert of Jerusalem, the former archbishop of Pisa, everything he had ruled over. But his Lorraine vassals ignored his testament and prevented the realm from falling under the patriarch's or under Pisan rule by installing Godfrey's brother Baldwin, count of Edessa, who had himself crowned king. As Godfrey had not been married, he had no children. His vassals, in elevating his brother, had the rules governing the succession of fiefs in Lorraine and northern France on their side. When Baldwin I died in 1118 he had been married three times but was childless. As he was dying he designated his brother Eustace III, count of Boulogne, to succeed him. Should he decline, the vassals were to elect Baldwin of Bourcq who had succeeded Baldwin I as count of Edessa and was a kinsman of Godfrey and Baldwin I. In an assembly held after the funeral of Baldwin I the opinions were sharply divided. The legitimists favored Eustace, the pragmatists supported Baldwin of Bourcq. The latter had the advantage of being present and able to make deals with the leading magnate and the patriarch. He was elevated to the kingship and anointed at Easter 1118 but not crowned until Christmas 1119. That the opposition to him was based on the rules of inheritance can be read in William of Tyre who openly declared that he considered Baldwin's accession to have been somewhat irregular because it excluded the rightful heir from the legitimate succession.<sup>1</sup> This was, indeed, the

opinion of Eustace's supporters, who had sent an embassy to Europe to fetch him. With some difficulty he was persuaded to leave with them for the East. When they reached Apulia, it was learned that Baldwin II had been made king of Jerusalem. The ambassadors urged Eustace to go on with them because what had happened was illegal and could not possibly stand. The worst kind of civil strife in Jerusalem was avoided only because Eustace decided to turn around and go home.

Baldwin II was the first ruler of Jerusalem to have children, but he had only four daughters and no sons. On 1 October 1126 or 1127 his queen, Morphia, died.<sup>2</sup> It was time to settle his succession, as he no longer would have a son. The time was well chosen because the King's regency of Antioch, which had increasingly estranged him from his vassals since 1119, had been terminated in October 1126.<sup>3</sup>

It seems that the years 1126 and 1127 witnessed a series of arrangements by which the King's daughters were provided for and the succession was settled on the oldest daughter, Melisende. One should remember that at this time no rules had as yet been developed in the Latin East to govern the female succession to fiefs. It was not until 1171 that the count of Sancerre was called upon to mediate in a dispute concerning this problem.<sup>4</sup> He ruled that the oldest daughter should take over the undivided fief and should perform homage for it, but

<sup>1</sup>I should like to thank cordially the Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies in Washington, D.C., for its generous support of myself and my research while, along with other work, I was writing this study.

William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum*, XII.3, in *Recueil des Historiens des croisades. Historiens occidentaux*, I,1 and I,2 (Paris, 1844), 515 f. On the succession to

Baldwin I, see my study "Etudes sur l'histoire de Baudouin I<sup>er</sup> roi de Jérusalem," in H. E. Mayer, *Mélanges sur l'histoire du royaume latin de Jérusalem, Mémoires de la Société de l'histoire de Jérusalem*, N.S., 5 (Paris, 1983), 73–91.

<sup>2</sup>R. Hiestand, "Chronologisches zur Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem," *DA*, 26 (1970), 223 f.

<sup>3</sup>H. E. Mayer, "Jérusalem et Antioche sous Baudouin II," *CRAI* (1980), 717–33.

<sup>4</sup>*Idem*, "Die Seignurie de Joscelin und der Deutsche Orden," *Die geistlichen Ritterorden Europas*, ed. J. Fleckenstein and M. Hellmann, *Vorträge und Forschungen*, 26 (Constance, 1980), 183.

should at the same time provide for her younger sisters by assigning rear-fiefs to them. While this clause did not necessarily bear upon royal successions, the principle that younger daughters had to be provided for in one way or another is clearly evident.

Alice, the second oldest daughter of Baldwin II, was married to Bohemond II of Antioch in October 1126. Hodierna, the third, was married to the count of Tripoli by 1138, but may have been betrothed to him as early as 1127.<sup>5</sup> The touchiest case was that of the youngest daughter, Iveta. Of the four she was the only one born into the purple, after Baldwin II had been made king. Indeed, later in the century it was argued by Hodierna's son Raymond III of Tripoli that the succession of Baldwin II should not have gone to Melisende, but rather to his mother because, as opposed to Melisende, she had been born after Baldwin II had become king (which was not true).<sup>6</sup> Elsewhere I have assumed that this argument was predictable already in the late twenties but that it then applied to Iveta and that it had been felt that the safest way to exclude her was to remove her to the nunnery of St. Anne. The pretext for this may have been that Iveta had been given to the Muslims as a hostage for her father when she was four years old and it was argued that she had been raped there, which disqualified her as a wife.<sup>7</sup> While, given her age, such an argument would have been preposterous, this was, indeed, the opinion of a thirteenth-century chronicler of the East.<sup>8</sup>

Melisende was married three years after Alice.

<sup>5</sup>*Idem*, *Bistümer, Klöster und Stifte im Königreich Jerusalem*, Schriften der MGH, 26 (Stuttgart, 1977), 252–54.

<sup>6</sup>*Regni Hierosolimitani brevis historia*, ed. L. T. Belgrano, *Annali genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi continuatori*, 1, FStI (Rome, 1890), 136f. Cf. J. Riley-Smith, *The Feudal Nobility and the Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1174–1277* (London, 1973), 104.

<sup>7</sup>Mayer, *Bistümer*, 250–52, 255–57. Since I argue in this paper that the essential action in the marriage negotiations concerning Melisende was demanded by Fulk of Anjou rather than granted voluntarily by Jerusalem, it may be well to remember that Fulk must have been familiar with the argument of porphyrogeniture. He made two attempts to secure the English succession of Henry I for his children: in 1119 by marrying his daughter Matilda to William Aetheling, and in 1128 by marrying his son Geoffrey to the Empress Maud. After the death of King William Rufus his older brother Robert of Normandy, under the rules of primogeniture, had a better claim to England than did Henry I. Consequently Henry justified his accession by pointing out that he had been born into the purple whereas Robert had been born before the Conquest. Cf. C. N. L. Brooke, *The Saxon and Norman Kings* (London, 1963), 32, 143, 195–96.

<sup>8</sup>*Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier*, ed. L. de Mas Latrie (Paris, 1871), 5.

Since the kingdom was to go to Melisende, this was a most consequential action to have taken. In the fall of 1127 more likely than in early 1128, an embassy was sent to France consisting of William of Buris, prince of Galilee, and Guy of Brisebarre, lord of Beirut. They offered the hand of Melisende and a place in the succession to Baldwin II to count Fulk V of Anjou. The embassy was at his court in the spring of 1128, after the ambassadors had conferred with the King of France.<sup>9</sup>

Contrary to what has been said in historical literature, there is no reason to assume that King Louis VI had been asked by the ambassadors to choose a husband for Melisende and that Fulk of Anjou was his choice. Even though the ambassadors appeared unexpectedly (*ex improviso*) in Anjou, William of Tyre does not even mention the French King's participation in the matter and makes Fulk clearly the choice of the assembly held in the East before the departure of the embassy.<sup>10</sup> Likewise, the Angevin chronicles report that it was the ambassadors who made the choice, although *consilio regis (Francorum)*.<sup>11</sup> Louis' advice on the matter had to be obtained, of course, and being Louis' vassal Fulk formally had to ask his permission to leave France.<sup>12</sup> One cannot imagine that in the case of a royal succession the King and the magnates of Jerusalem would have given the ambassadors unrestricted power to bring home just anyone as the future king.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>9</sup>William of Tyre, XIII.24, XIV.2, pp. 593 f., 608. For the chronology, see Hiestand, "Chronologisches," 223, and my chronological appendix *infra*, pp. 146–47.

<sup>10</sup>William of Tyre, *loc. cit.*

<sup>11</sup>*Chroniques des comtes d'Anjou*, ed. L. Halphen and R. Poupardin (Paris, 1913), 69 (*Gesta consulum Andegavorum*), 115 (*Gesta Ambazensium dominorum*, where the *ex improviso* occurs).

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, 115.

<sup>13</sup>Two analogies suggest that such choices had to be made in Jerusalem. In 1177 the count of Flanders suggested that the King's sister Sibyl, one of the two possible heiresses to the throne, should marry. He was told that he ought to name a candidate. He replied that he would do so only after the barons had sworn to abide by his proposal. The answer given to the count was that it would reflect on the King's honor to marry his sister to *personae ignotae et cuius etiam nomen ignoraretur* (William of Tyre, XXI.14–15, pp. 1028–30). When a ruler had to be chosen by finding a husband for Maria la Marquise, an assembly was held in the East, and it was then that someone in the assembly got up and put forward the name of count John of Brienne, who married Maria in 1210. After the decision had been taken, an embassy was sent to Philip Augustus of France, who only had to approve it or, at best, make the selection formally (Ernoul, *Chronique*, 407 f.). Other sources place the election in the hands of Philip Augustus without a prior decision having been taken in the East (cf. R. Röhrich, *Geschichte des Königreichs Jerusalem* [Innsbruck, 1898], 698 note 1), but actually Philip was at first so

Fulk was certainly not unknown in the Holy Land. In 1120 he had undertaken a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.<sup>14</sup> His behavior in the East had been magnificent. He had maintained there at his expense a force of one hundred knights for a year.<sup>15</sup> That his first wife had died late in 1126 (*infra*, p. 146) need not have passed unnoticed in Jerusalem: there was a whole year to learn about it. Moreover, in 1120 Fulk had affiliated himself with the newly founded Knights Templars and had given them an annual rent of 30 pounds of Anjou which meant much to them in those days.<sup>16</sup> Fulk was much more likely the choice of the King of Jerusalem and of his barons than of Louis VI of France.

The ambassadors had been sent with the common consent of the nobility.<sup>17</sup> This implies a unanimous decision. They had been instructed to take a solemn oath on the souls of the King and the magnates that within fifty days after the safe arrival of the candidate in the East he would be married to the King's oldest daughter *cum spe regni post regis obitum*. He arrived with the embassy in midspring of 1129, i.e., in May, because immediately after his arrival but before Whitsun (2 June) 1129 the wedding was performed.<sup>18</sup> As Meli-

sende's dowry, the King settled on the couple the cities of Acre and Tyre to hold during his lifetime. From now on, William of Tyre says, Fulk assisted Baldwin throughout his life in his rule.<sup>19</sup> It is clear that Fulk was more than just a son-in-law. He actively participated in the government. With Acre and Tyre he controlled the economically most important parts of the royal demesne.

Fulk V of Anjou was no fool and a circumspect man. When he left for the East in 1129 he did so with the intention to become king of Jerusalem and never to return. This was also his essential obligation under the contract. Even though he did not relinquish his title as count of Anjou (*infra*, p. 144), he transferred his counties of Anjou and Maine to his son Geoffrey. If his kingship had collapsed and he had been forced to return, he would have been in difficulties with Geoffrey. It would also have been a deadly loss of prestige for him, such as he could not afford to risk. There had to be guarantees.

But was it not enough that the King and the princes by common consent offered him Melisende's hand? The ambassadors could assure him that this was the case. Unanimous decisions were, however, not necessarily considered irrevocable, as we can see from a later example. In 1175 a marriage contract very similar to the one made with Fulk was arranged with the marquis William Longsword of Montferrat.<sup>20</sup> Within forty days after his arrival in the Holy Land he was to be married to the king's older sister Sibyl and was to receive the county of Jaffa-Ascalon. The succession to the throne was involved, because the leper king Baldwin IV could not marry. The point which was the cause of the discussion was no longer female succession as such, but rather whether Sibyl or the king's younger half sister Isabel had the better claim. The invitation had been sent with the unanimous consent of the clergy and the barons, and the latter had taken a personal oath to observe the contract. Yet there was an opposition. William of Tyre complained in bitter words that there were some who had been consulted on the matter but, after the marquis' arrival in 1176, argued that they had not given the matter sufficient thought at the time and were now opposed to it. Nothing came of this op-

much opposed to letting John go that Innocent III had to write to him on 23 April 1209 (PL, 216, col. 36 f., No. 37) admonishing him that he should allow John to go. The choice was, therefore, certainly made in the East and not by the King of France.

<sup>14</sup>*Recueil d'annales angevines et vendômoises*, ed. L. Halphen (Paris, 1903), 8 (*Annales de Saint-Aubin*), 120 (*Annales de Saint-Florent*). He took the cross a few days after having attended on 25 April 1120 the consecration of the church of Saint-Julien at Le Mans (*Gesta episcop. Cenomannensium*, in Bouquet's *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, new edition by L. Delisle, 12 [Paris, 1877], 551), but any attempt to date his return is hopeless. J. Chartrou, *L'Anjou de 1109 à 1151* (Paris, 1928), 15 note 2, and 267, No. 52, pointed to a charter for Saint-Nicolas d'Angers, dated on Sunday, 29 January 1121, in Fulk's presence. This is evidence that he had returned. She observed that Sunday fell on 29 January in 1122, not in 1121, and placed the charter in 1122. While this is correct, she failed to observe that Pope Calixtus II (elected 2 February 1119) was also present, and a visit to Anjou cannot be reconciled with the Pope's itinerary for 1121 or 1122, but can have taken place only in 1119 (before his election) or 1120. The year of his visit to Anjou is given as 1119 in the *Annales de Saint-Aubin* and as 1120 in the *Annales de Saint-Florent* (*Recueil d'annales angevines*, 7, 120). In 1120 he can be shown to have been in Fontevrault on 31 August and in Angers from 7 to 9 September (JL. 6738).

<sup>15</sup>William of Tyre, XIV.2, p. 608. See *infra*, note 35.

<sup>16</sup>Ordericus Vitalis, *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. M. Chibnall, 6 (Oxford, 1978), 310; cf. F. Lundgreen, "Zur Geschichte des Templerordens," *MittÖG*, 35 (1914), 679.

<sup>17</sup>William of Tyre, XIII.14, XIV.2, pp. 593 f., 608.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, XIII.14, p. 593f. The arrival is dated *anno sequenti circa veris medium*, which refers to the year following the election of archbishop William I of Tyre which took place in the spring of 1128 (*infra*, note 22).

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*: *Adstitit . . . comes . . . domino regi tota vita sua fideliter in negotiis regni ingrediens et egrediens, filii devote implens officium*. R. Hiestand, "Zwei unbekannte Diplome der lateinischen Könige von Jerusalem aus Lucca," *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, 50 (1971), 30, even thinks that Fulk may have been adopted by Baldwin II.

<sup>20</sup>William of Tyre, XXI.13, p. 1025 f.

position because the marquis died in 1177. But certainly Fulk had to take into account the possibility of subsequent adverse arguments.

The negotiations in Anjou were apparently not easy and they took a long time. The embassy arrived in Anjou in the spring of 1128, and Fulk took the cross on 31 May 1128. But this did not mean that a settlement had been reached. It was only a visible sign that Fulk was in principle prepared to go to the East, provided that a suitable arrangement were reached. In order to become king of Jerusalem Fulk did not have to take the cross at all. He only had to marry Melisende. If no satisfactory settlement were reached, Fulk would come simply as a seasonal crusader as he had done in 1120. The ambassadors must have understood that by taking the cross Fulk did not yet commit himself to become king of Jerusalem, and that more was needed to persuade him. It still took almost a whole year to settle the business, since Fulk did not leave until the spring (around March, as he arrived in the East in May) of 1129. In offering Acre and Tyre the King had put out a bait which was as big as he could possibly afford. But it was not equal to what Fulk would have to give up in France.

Material matters, however, were not at the center of the discussions, because in the end Fulk was content to accept Acre and Tyre. The obstacles lay in legal and political considerations. First of all, it was the first female succession in the kingdom, and as Fulk well knew such a thing was a touchy issue. We shall revert to this point. Fulk had to make sure that the principle of a female succession would be firmly established in Jerusalem before he could consider going there. He also needed assurances that no other daughter of the King than Melisende should be allowed to enter a claim for the succession. As has been seen (*supra*, p. 140), the legality of her succession was contested considerably later, when it was convenient.

Moreover, Fulk had especially to take into consideration that the accession of Baldwin II in 1118 had, itself, not been uncontested, and had met with considerable opposition because Eustace III of Boulogne, who had been outwitted by Baldwin II, had had the better claim. Any shadow on Baldwin's kingship, such as recorded by William of Tyre (*supra*, p. 139), might cast doubts on Melisende's claim on which, in turn, Fulk's expectancies rested. True, the events of 1118 had now been history for an entire decade. But Fulk must have learned about them when he was in Jerusalem in 1120 and they were still very recent. Also, Fulk had been one of

the main supporters of William Clito in Normandy. As the son of Robert Curthose of Normandy, this nephew of Henry I of England retained a stubborn claim to the duchy of Normandy, where Henry I, after his conquest of the duchy, could never feel safe as long as Clito was alive. Thus, Fulk knew how long old claims and counterclaims could survive.

It seems that the author of the chronicle of the counts of Anjou was aware of this problem. Having told of the marriage of Fulk to Melisende, he gave an account of the rulers of Jerusalem from Godfrey of Bouillon to Baldwin II, focusing on the successions.<sup>21</sup> Nothing was said of the deeds of these kings. The author only related the way in which the crown passed from one to the next. In so doing he omitted the grave difficulties which had arisen in the accessions of both Baldwin I and Baldwin II. He stressed that the (seemingly uncontested) election of Baldwin II had been made *inito salubri consilio*, as if there had been no rival claim on behalf of Eustace III. In the author's story the succession of the kings of Jerusalem had always been orderly and legitimate. Consequently, the same applied to Fulk. The truth, however, had been different. And Fulk knew it.

But so did Baldwin II of Jerusalem. He must have foreseen difficulties on this point. He tried to assuage any hesitations which might arise on Fulk's side over this issue. He caused his ambassadors to seek, first, the approval of Louis VI of France before they traveled on to Anjou. And he went further than this. He laid the matter before the Pope. In May 1128 the archbishop William I of Tyre (not to be confused with the chronicler) and the bishop Roger of Ramla were at the Roman Curia. Their main preoccupation was a thorny ecclesiastical affair, namely, whether the archbishopric of Tyre was to belong to the patriarchate of Antioch or to that of Jerusalem. The first archbishop of Tyre had been elected in 1122, but had died before the city was conquered in 1124. No successor was appointed until William I was elected and consecrated by Patriarch Warmund of Jerusalem in the spring of 1128.<sup>22</sup>

In Rome the two bishops not only transacted ec-

<sup>21</sup> *Chroniques des comtes d'Anjou*, 70 (*Gesta consulum Andegavorum*).

<sup>22</sup> William of Tyre, XIII.23, p. 591, dates this *vere demum proximo subsecuto, quarto anno* after the conquest of Tyre, which was taken on 7 July 1124. William's chronology is sometimes vague. But since he himself was archbishop of Tyre, we must credit him with precise knowledge of his predecessor's election.

clesiastical business but also conferred with the Pope on very worldly matters. On 29 May 1128 Pope Honorius II wrote a letter to King Baldwin II which has given rise to much unfounded speculation.<sup>23</sup> It is clearly said in the letter that the two bishops had also come to Rome on the King's business, as *nobilitatis tue legati*. The Pope elaborated on the King being a just and religious ruler and on how he had kept with royal wisdom the peace in the territory conquered by his predecessors Godfrey of Bouillon and Baldwin I, and how he had added many victories to theirs. He also alluded to the King's captivity in Muslim hands. Then Honorius confirmed to Baldwin II the kingdom of Jerusalem *cum dignitate*, i.e., with the royal title, as it had been confirmed to Baldwin I and to the Church of Jerusalem by Paschal II.<sup>24</sup> He ordered him to pre-

serve the state of the kingdom and the Church of Jerusalem in its full integrity and recommended to this effect (*ad hec*) Count Fulk of Anjou to the King. Fulk, so the Pope wrote, had decided to leave behind him his large possessions in order to serve God and the King.

In reality, on 29 May 1128 Fulk had decided nothing yet. He did not even take the cross until two days after the papal letter had been written, and even this act was not a firm commitment. He was still negotiating. Although the letter was solicited by the King's bishops and was addressed to Baldwin II, to whom it was no doubt sent, the real recipient was Fulk of Anjou. The bishops knew and must have informed the Pope that an embassy had been sent to Anjou and for what purpose. They must have made certain that a copy of the letter would reach the ambassadors in Anjou. It was a useful letter for them to have because it expressly recognized the legitimacy of Baldwin II's kingship and gave papal endorsement to Fulk's candidacy for the throne of Jerusalem.

But, while the letter might help to assuage any fears Fulk might have entertained in this respect, the real decision concerning the succession of Baldwin II lay not with the Pope but with the nobility of Jerusalem. Fulk could not be entirely sure that the old doubts would not be revived until he had received a number of guarantees: 1. that Baldwin II's kingship was officially recognized to be legal; 2. that Melisende was officially declared to be the heiress of the kingdom; 3. that Fulk was given a firm promise that upon his arrival he would be married to her and be financially provided for; 4. that he would succeed Baldwin II as king by virtue of his marriage to Melisende; 5. that all this was enacted by the nobility of Jerusalem.

Questions 3 and 4 were of course solved by the marriage proposals brought from the East by the King's ambassadors. We have no knowledge that any assurances were ever given by Jerusalem on the legitimacy of Baldwin's kingship, and it is most unlikely that this should have happened. Jerusalem could not very well go beyond what it had already done in soliciting from the Pope as a universal power a recognition of Baldwin's kingship. A formal recognition of its legitimacy by the nobles in 1128 would have been preposterous after the King had ruled for fully ten years. It would, in fact, not have served anyone's interests, for it would only have cast doubts on the legitimacy of his rule during these ten years.

Furthermore, it was not necessary, since an offi-

<sup>23</sup> JL. 7314 = E. de Rozière, *Cartulaire de l'église du Saint-Sépulcre de Jérusalem*, Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, série I, vol. 5 (Paris, 1849), 17, No. 15. J. Hansen, *Das Problem eines Kirchenstaates in Jerusalem* (Luxemburg, 1928), 119 f., correctly interpreted this letter as a confirmation of Baldwin's kingship by the Pope, but went too far in asserting that the Pope could also have withheld the confirmation and would thereby have made Baldwin's continued rule impossible. He felt, moreover, that the letter paved the way for claims by Patriarch Stephen of Jerusalem to an ecclesiastical overlordship over the kingdom of Jerusalem. M. W. Baldwin, "The Papacy and the Levant during the Twelfth Century," *Bulletin of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America*, 3 (1945), 282, says that the Pope "conceded" the kingdom of Jerusalem to Baldwin II and sees the letter as having more nearly the appearance of a claim to papal suzerainty than any other document. H. S. Fink, "The Foundation of the Latin States, 1099–1118," *A History of the Crusades*, ed. K. M. Setton, 1 (Philadelphia, 1955), 379, referring to Baldwin, believes that the letter claimed Jerusalem as a papal fief. J. G. Rowe, "The Papacy and the Ecclesiastical Province of Tyre," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 43 (1960–61), 175, supports Baldwin as to the "concession" of the kingdom by the Pope but denies that the letter was a papal claim for suzerainty over Jerusalem. He links it with the problem of the archbishopric of Tyre. The letter coincides in time with papal rulings on this subject (JL. Nos. 7315–17) but has nothing whatsoever to do with them in substance. H. E. Mayer, *Geschichte der Kreuzzüge* (Stuttgart, 1965), 272 note 31 = *idem*, *The Crusades* (London, 1972), 294 note 31, rejected the idea that the letter claimed feudal subordination of Jerusalem to the Church and interpreted it as a confirmation of Baldwin's kingship, but mistakenly saw in this act a veiled papal rejection of the claims of the new patriarch Stephen of Jerusalem to the possession of Jaffa (cf. William of Tyre, XIII.25, p. 595). Since we now know that Stephen was elected between 27 July and 19 October 1128 (Hiestand, "Chronologisches," 229), this is impossible, as Hiestand correctly observed (*ibid.*, 228 note 54). The letter had already rightly been interpreted as a papal endorsement of Fulk of Anjou (without being linked to the matter of the legitimacy of Baldwin's kingship) by W. Hotzelt, *Kirchengeschichte Palästinas im Zeitalter der Kreuzzüge 1099–1291* (Cologne, 1940), 96, by Chartrou, *Anjou*, 227 note 1 (where it is erroneously dated 1129), and by S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, 2 (Cambridge, 1952), 178.

<sup>24</sup> No such confirmation by Paschal II is extant, and it is certainly not permissible to see in this an allusion to JL. No. 6297 of 1111, as Rowe, "Province of Tyre," 175, does.

cial appointment of Melisende as heiress of the kingdom would imply that her father had ruled legitimately. At the same time this would rule out all possibilities for any of her sisters entering a claim. And this appointment was indeed made.<sup>25</sup> In March of 1129, shortly before Fulk's arrival in the Holy Land, a charter of Baldwin II was attested by *Milissenda filia regis* as first witness, even before the ecclesiastical dignitaries.<sup>26</sup> Another charter of the King, which is undated but must be placed in early 1129, was even more explicit.<sup>27</sup> It was attested by *Milissenda filia regis et regni Ierosolimitani heres*, and again she headed the witness list, which, however, did not include any churchmen.

After his arrival and his wedding Fulk attested, after the King and as count of Anjou, a charter issued in 1129 by the archbishop of Tyre.<sup>28</sup> Again as count of Anjou and together with Melisende he attested a charter of the King which is undated but must be placed between September 1130 and 21 August 1131.<sup>29</sup> And finally, later on, Fulk himself claimed in a charter from the early part of his reign (*ca.* 1131–34) that Baldwin II had appointed him also *heres regni*.<sup>30</sup> This is supported by Orderic Vitalis, who refers twice to Fulk as *heres* of Baldwin II, at a time when the latter was still alive.<sup>31</sup>

In any case there can be no doubt that Melisende had formally been declared *heres regni*. Both Hiestand and I assumed that this had been done before the embassy left for Europe in the fall of 1127

to invite Fulk.<sup>32</sup> We both took it for granted that this elevation was effected in order to make the bride more attractive to Fulk and to safeguard the interests of dynastic succession. In doing so we overlooked Fulk's interest and English precedent. Fulk had clear objectives. The opinion among the nobility of Jerusalem was divided, at least in the beginning, because William of Tyre says that the embassy was sent to Anjou *post multam deliberationem*.<sup>33</sup> But Fulk had a much more vital interest in the elevation of Melisende to the position of a *heres regni* than Jerusalem had. Also given the length of the negotiations, which took a full year, from the spring of 1128 to the spring of 1129, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the initiative for Melisende's promotion came from Fulk after he had been presented with the proposed marriage contract and had taken the cross as a sign that basically he was willing to go if a satisfactory arrangement could be worked out. We would then have to assume further that the negotiations took so long because his demands had to be relayed to Jerusalem and an answer had to be brought back.

The length of the negotiations suggests that this was, indeed, the case. Also, it has gone unnoticed that William of Tyre reports two ambassadors (William of Galilee and Guy of Brisebarre) as having left for Europe, but mentions only William of Galilee as having returned with Fulk in 1129.<sup>34</sup> From this alone one could certainly not draw the conclusion that Guy of Brisebarre went back to Jerusalem to obtain a decision on Fulk's demands. But he is conspicuously absent from the two Angevin charters of April and May 1128 discussed below (p. 147). Both mention the presence of Hugh of Payens, the Master of the Knights Templars. The *notitia* about the events of May 1128 is also attested by William of Galilee, but not by Guy of Brisebarre. The other charter of April 1128 was confirmed in early 1129 by Fulk's son Geoffrey on the eve of Fulk's departure: *cum secunda vice Ierosolimam ire me disposuissem*,

<sup>25</sup> R. Hiestand, "Zwei Diplome aus Lucca," 27. H. E. Mayer, "Studies in the History of Queen Melisende," *DOP*, 26 (1972), 99.

<sup>26</sup> R. Röhrich, *Regesta regni Hierosolimitani*, 1 vol. and *Addamentum* (Innsbruck, 1893–1904; henceforth abbreviated as *RRH*), No. 121. For the date, see Hiestand, "Chronologisches," 223 note 15, 229 note 60.

<sup>27</sup> *RRH*, No. 137a. For the date, see Hiestand, "Chronologisches," 224 note 27; *idem*, "Zwei Diplome aus Lucca," 27 note 86; Mayer, "Queen Melisende," 99 note 15.

<sup>28</sup> *RRH*, No. 127. William of Tyre, XIV.2, p. 608, stresses that Fulk, after his arrival and in spite of his large possessions of Acre and Tyre, continued to call himself count (of Anjou), which was certainly the only title he was given by the chancery of Baldwin II. Du Cange, *Les familles d'Outremer*, ed. E. G. Rey, Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France (Paris, 1869), 16, claimed to have seen a charter by Fulk for the canons of Saint-Laud in Angers in which he styled himself king of Jerusalem and count of Anjou, but neither Rey nor Chartrou, *Anjou*, 227 note 4, nor A. Planchenault, the editor of the cartulary of Saint-Laud, has been able to trace it. If it ever existed, it would be an exceedingly interesting document but would have to be referred to Fulk's time as king of Jerusalem after 1131.

<sup>29</sup> *RRH*, No. 137. For the date, see Hiestand, "Chronologisches," 229 note 60.

<sup>30</sup> Hiestand, "Zwei Diplome aus Lucca," 54.

<sup>31</sup> Orderic Vitalis, ed. Chibnall, 6, 136, 390.

<sup>32</sup> Hiestand, "Chronologisches," 223; *idem*, "Zwei Diplome aus Lucca," 27; Mayer, "Queen Melisende," 99.

<sup>33</sup> William of Tyre, XIV.2, p. 608.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, XIV.2, XIII.24, pp. 608, 593. The author of the *Gesta episcoporum Cenomannensium* (Bouquet, *Recueil*, 12, p. 552) expressly says that Patriarch Stephen of Jerusalem subscribed to the offer of the crown to Fulk. Since the embassy left the East in the fall of 1127 and since Stephen was not elected until some time between 27 July and 19 October 1128 (*supra*, note 23), it follows that somebody must have gone back to Jerusalem to obtain his assent, unless the chronicler is guilty of a misnomer and was referring to Stephen's predecessor Warmund (died 27 July 1128).

so that it would stand after Fulk had permanently left. This confirmation was again attested by William of Buris, prince of Galilee, but not by Guy of Brisebarre. As the embassy was asked to attest these local charters in the first place and as Angevin nobles of much less standing than Guy attested on these occasions, we cannot but conclude that Guy was not in Anjou either in April 1128 or in early 1129 but had gone back to Jerusalem.<sup>35</sup>

To clinch the argument it must be pointed out that for a demand that Melisende be formally declared *heres regni* Fulk had an illustrious precedent, which he very well knew, since he was directly involved in it. So far historians of the Crusades have completely ignored this affair, whereas English historians, for whom it is a *cause célèbre*, have not noticed the impact of their own history on that of Jerusalem. When the White Ship foundered off Barfleur in November 1120 and William Aetheling drowned in the Channel, the succession to King Henry I of England became a completely open question. This was a blow not only to Henry I, but also to Fulk of Anjou who had married his own daughter Matilda to William in 1119. Matilda took the veil at Fontevrault. Henry never seems to have considered any of his illegitimate sons, of which he had a good number, to succeed him. Not until Emperor Henry V died in 1125 was there another way out of the crisis. The Empress Maud, Henry's

daughter, was recalled by her father to England in September 1126. As long as the Emperor had been alive, she could not be considered as heiress to Henry I, as this would have entailed the danger of England becoming a part of the Empire. But after the Emperor's death Henry decided to settle his succession on her. She was, in fact, the only alternative to William Clito, who lived up to 1128.<sup>36</sup> On 1 January 1127 Henry solemnly recognized her as *heres Angliae*, reserving only the unlikely case that he should have a son from his second wife.<sup>37</sup> Bringing pressure on his barons he made them take a solemn oath to the same effect in which the archbishop of Canterbury and David, king of Scots, joined. This did not happen without a certain measure of grumbling among the barons, for Maud had left England at the age of eight and had been brought up in Germany. She was looked on almost as a foreigner. But what caused much more grum-

<sup>36</sup> That William Clito had supporters among the English feudatories has been well shown by C. W. Hollister, "The Anglo-Norman Succession Debate of 1126: Prelude to Stephen's Anarchy," *JMH*, 1 (1975), 19–31.

<sup>37</sup> Simeon of Durham, *Historia regum in Opera omnia*, ed. Th. Arnold, Rolls Series, 75,2 (London, 1885), 281: *iuraverunt, ut filiae suae imperatrici fide servata regnum Angliae haereditario iure post eum servarent*; William of Malmesbury, *Historia novella*, ed. K. R. Potter (Edinburgh, 1955), 3 f.: *omnes totius Angliae optimates . . . sacramento adegit et obstrinxit, ut . . . Matildam filiam suam quondam imperatricem incunctanter et sine ulla retractione dominam susciperent*; *Two of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, ed. Ch. Plummer, on the basis of an edition by J. Earle, 1 (Oxford, 1892), 256; Florence of Worcester, *Chronicon ex chronicis*, ed. B. Thorpe, English Historical Society, 2 (London, 1849), 84 f.; Continuator of William of Jumièges, *Gesta Normannorum ducum*, ed. J. Marx, Société de l'histoire de Normandie (Rouen, 1914), 299; William of Newburgh, *Historia rerum Anglicarum, in Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I*, ed. R. Howlett, Rolls Series, 82,1 (London, 1884), 29 f.; Gervase of Canterbury, *Opera historica*, ed. W. Stubbs, Rolls Series, 73,1 (London, 1879), 93: *fecit principes et potentes Angliae adiurare eidem filiae suae et heredibus suis legitimis regnum Angliae . . . Henry I Normanniam petiit, ducens secum filiam suam eximperialicem, iam Angliae haeredem*. Cf. H. A. Cronne, *The Reign of Stephen 1135–54. Anarchy in England* (London, 1970), 28. The clause reserving the succession to possible future male offspring of Henry is found in Simeon of Durham, William of Malmesbury, Florence of Worcester, and Gervase of Canterbury instruct us that the oath was taken not only to Maud but also to her as yet unborn children. The phrase *Angliae haeres* occurs in the chronicles only in Gervase of Canterbury (and, indirectly, in Florence of Worcester where it is said that Henry I *alium [filium] qui regni haeres legitime existeret necdum susceperat et ea re in filiam suam . . . regni iura transferebat*), although the sense of the others is clearly the same. See also the charter of Empress Maud for Milo of Gloucester of 1139 in H. A. Cronne and R. H. C. Davis, *Regesta regis Stephani ac Mathildis imperatricis ac Gaufridi et Henrici ducum Normannorum 1135–1154*, *Regesta regum Anglo-Normannorum*, 3 (Oxford, 1968), No. 391: *venit ad me apud Bristoliam et recepit me ut dominam et sicut illam quam iustam heredem regni Anglie recognovit*.

<sup>35</sup> I do not attach any significance to the story of William of Tyre, XIV.2, p. 608, that Fulk went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem after the death of his wife Aremburg (1126) but before he was invited by Baldwin II to come East. Such a pilgrimage would have to be placed after Fulk had taken the cross on 31 May 1128 and after the wedding of Fulk's son Geoffrey on 17 June 1128 (*infra*, p. 146), and Fulk would have been back in Anjou on 18 November 1128 (Chartrou, *Anjou*, 278, No. 88). This would have enabled him to present his demands in person. If he had maintained the 100 knights for a year in Palestine during this pilgrimage, as William of Tyre says he did, he would have had much more reason for such a lavish outlay than in 1120. It would also explain why Pope Honorius II in his letter of 29 May 1128 (*supra*, note 23) wrote that Fulk had already decided to come to the East. The references to two pilgrimages in the charter of April 1128 with the confirmation of early 1129 (*eo anno quo mihi Hierosolimam ire contigit et cum secunda vice Ierosolimam ire me disposuissem*) would not have referred to the pilgrimages of 1120 and 1129, but to those of 1128 and 1129. Fulk would personally have concluded the marriage contract in Jerusalem in the summer of 1128 and would have returned briefly to Anjou for the winter of 1128/29 to wind up his affairs. Tempting as all this is, I discard it as the result of a confusion on William's part with the pilgrimage of 1120, since William himself says that after his return Fulk ruled Anjou for several years and since the Angevin chronicles do not know anything of a trip of Fulk to the East in 1128.



bling was that the barons found it hard to accept that in the future they should live under a woman's rule.

As the Empress was only twenty-four years old, the question of her remarriage now took on quite different dimensions. The barons, therefore, gave their oath subject to the condition that she ought not to be married outside the English kingdom without their consent. At least, this was the excuse of those who in 1135 refused to accept her and rather chose Stephen of Blois as king.<sup>38</sup> This measure of precaution had no effect on Henry I. Not more than half a year after the oath of 1 January 1127, between 22 May (Pentecost) and the end of August 1127, Empress Maud was betrothed to Geoffrey, the son of Fulk V of Anjou. On 10 June 1128 young Geoffrey was dubbed a knight by Henry I at Rouen and on 17 June 1128, not even three weeks after Fulk had taken the cross, the wedding was publicly celebrated at Le Mans.<sup>39</sup> At this time the embassy from the East was already with Fulk, having arrived in the spring of 1128. Fulk had known about the betrothal for a year. For a year and a half he had known about the recognition of Maud as *heres Angliae*. Since the proclamation of Melisende as *heres regni* of Jerusalem was made after the death of her mother, Queen Morphia (26 October 1126 or 26 October 1127), which removed all hopes of a male succession there, Palestine cannot have furnished the model for the English succession. It must have been the other way around. And it is equally clear that it must have been Fulk of Anjou, the new father-in-law of the Empress, who during the year 1128 demanded that Melisende be given the same position in Jerusalem as Maud had in England. It is then easily explicable that in early 1129 the chancery of Jerusalem introduced her as witness to royal charters<sup>40</sup> and once stressed her official position as *heres regni*. It was a demonstration that Fulk's demands had been met. The sink-

ing of the White Ship had caused ripples which went much further than has so far been noticed.

## APPENDIX

### The Chronology of the Eastern Embassy to Anjou

The dating of the embassy has briefly been dealt with by Hiestand, "Chronologisches," p. 223, but more detailed remarks are in order here, since my argument in this paper hinges in part on the dating of the embassy. William of Tyre, XIII.24, p. 593, places the embassy much earlier than 1127/1128 (departure from the East and arrival in Anjou). He says that William of Buris, prince of Galilee and one of the ambassadors, was *statim a domino rege de hostium vinculis educto directus* to fetch Fulk. Baldwin II was released from captivity on 29 August 1124 (Fulcher of Chartres, *Historia Hierosolymitana*, III.38, ed. H. Hagenmeyer [Heidelberg, 1913], p. 749 f.). Such an early date for the legation is impossible. First, Fulk's wife Aremburg lived until 1126 (*Recueil d'annales angevines et vendômoises*, ed. L. Halphen [Paris, 1903], p. 8 [*Annales de Saint-Aubin*], p. 121 [*Annales de Saint-Florent*]). On 15 January 1127 she was dead because on this date Fulk executed a donation she had made to Fontevrault when she lay dying (J. Chartrou, *L'Anjou de 1109 à 1151* [Paris, 1928], p. 362, No. 35). Also William of Buris was still in Palestine on 2 May 1125, on 17 January 1126 (as *Willelmus Tiberiadis*), and in 1126, *ind. IV*, i.e., before September 1126 (*RRH*, Nos. 105, 112, 113, 115). He was back in 1129 (*RRH*, No. 131). Guy of Brisebarre, the second ambassador, was with him in Palestine on 17 January 1126. This precludes the early date for the embassy given by William of Tyre.

On the coming of the embassy to Anjou, see *Recueil d'annales angevines*, p. 8 (*Annales de Saint-Aubin*), and *Chroniques des comtes d'Anjou*, ed. L. Halphen and R. Poupardin (Paris, 1913), p. 69 (*Chronica de gestis consulum Andegavorum*), p. 115 (*Gesta Ambaziensium dominorum*), and *Gesta episcoporum Cenomannensium* in Bouquet's *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, new edition by L. Delisle, 12 (Paris, 1877), p. 552. A. Luchaire, *Louis VI le Gros. Annales de sa vie et de son règne* (Paris, 1890), p. 207, No. 444, proposed 1129 for their coming to France. This ignores not only the chronology of events in the East where Fulk arrived already in May 1129 (*supra*, note 18), but also charter evidence from Anjou, on the basis of which Luchaire's date was refuted by Halphen-Poupardin, *Chroniques des comtes d'Anjou*, p. 69, note 4. Luchaire was led astray by dating the marriage of Fulk's son Geoffrey, which preceded Fulk's departure for the East, in 1129 (p. 207), although on p. cv, confusing it with the betrothal, he had placed it in 1127. The correct date is 1128 (*supra*, p. 146).

By the spring of 1128 the embassy had been joined in

Melisende's sister Hodierna of Tripoli and by Helvis of Ramla, who again attested a charter of Fulk in 1142 (*RRH*, Nos. 179, 210). Cf. H. E. Mayer, "Carving up Crusaders: The Early Ibelins and Ramlas," *Outremer. Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem Presented to Joshua Prawer* (Jerusalem, 1982), 115.

<sup>38</sup> William of Malmesbury, *op. cit.*, 4, describing the argument of Bishop Roger of Salisbury, who considered himself absolved from the oath because of this and who did not tire of repeating it. Only three men had known of the upcoming marriage, he said. William of Malmesbury points out that as early as 1127 everyone had predicted that the oath would eventually not be adhered to.

<sup>39</sup> The chronology of these events and, in particular, the year of the wedding has been established by K. Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings*, I (London, 1887), 258–60, and by Chartrou, *Anjou*, 22 f. note 4, against Luchaire, *Louis VI le Gros*, pp. cv, 207, who opted for both 1127 and 1129 (*infra*, p. 146).

<sup>40</sup> While it was certainly unusual and occurred here for the first time in the Latin East that a woman served as witness to a royal charter, it was not unique (so Hiestand, "Zwei Diplome aus Lucca," 27). In 1138 a royal charter by Fulk was attested by



Anjou by Hugh of Payens, the Master of the Knights Templars. He had been sent by the King and an assembly of the barons to Europe to fetch help for the conquest of Damascus (William of Tyre, XIII.26, p. 595, dating Hugh's return to the East *anno sequenti*, after the death of Patriarch Warmund of Jerusalem and the election of his successor Stephen, both of which occurred in 1128; cf. Hiestand, "Chronologisches," p. 229). Since Hugh of Payens participated on 13 January 1128 in the Council of Troyes which established the rule of the Templars, he is likely to have left the East in the fall of 1127; he had been dispatched by the same assembly which entrusted William of Buris and Guy of Brisebarre to invite Fulk of Anjou. The presence of Hugh of Payens in Anjou in the spring of 1128 is known from two Angevin charters. At an unspecified time in 1128 Fulk confirmed a donation he had made before his first pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1120 (Chartrou, *Anjou*, p. 367, No. 38 = Marquis d'Albon, *Cartulaire général de l'Ordre du Temple (1119?–1150)* [Paris, 1913], p. 5, No. 8). It is dated in the year 1127, but since the year in Anjou began at Easter, it must be placed in 1128, not later than 22 April. Any date in 1127 must be ruled out because the itinerary of Hugh of Payens, who attested the charter, does not allow for this. M. L. Bulst-Thiele, *Sacrae domus militiae Templi Hierosolymitani magistri. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Templerordens 1118/19–1314*, AbhGött, Philol.-hist.Kl., 3. Folge, 86 (Göttingen, 1974), p. 25, note 20, places it, in fact, in April 1128 and correctly so because of its connection in time with the following charter of May 1128 discussed here. On Ascension Day (31 May) 1128 Fulk of Anjou took the

cross at Le Mans. Hugh of Amboise had been summoned there to answer before Fulk in litigation brought against him by the monks of Marmoutier. He first refused to give up his claims, but when he saw that Fulk would not support him he allowed Hugh of Payens to effect a settlement. Shortly thereafter Hugh of Amboise, having taken the cross himself *quia Ierusalem profecturus erat*, came to Marmoutier to repent once more. The monks composed a *notitia* on these events dated *a. inc. 1128, ind. VII* (Chartrou, *Anjou*, p. 369, No. 39 = d'Albon, *Cartulaire du Temple*, p. 8, No. 12). It must be dated after 1 September 1128 (because of *ind. VII*) but before 14 April 1129 (because of the Angevin Easter style). As it is mentioned that William of Buris attended the ceremony of Fulk's taking the cross on the previous Ascension Day, it follows conclusively that this event must have taken place on Ascension 1128 and that by that time the ambassadors had arrived in Anjou and had been joined there by Hugh of Payens.

#### ADDITIONAL NOTE

At the time I read the galley proofs of this article I received John Gillingham's fine book *The Angevin Empire* (London, 1984). It is only fair to point out that on page 9 of his book Gillingham has already noted that the circumstances of Fulk V of Anjou's transfer to Jerusalem were strikingly similar to what happened between Anjou and England a little earlier. Thus, although Mr. Gillingham's subject was not Jerusalem, it led directly to the events preceding those I have discussed in this paper.